

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Brox 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,421	01/21/2004	Chia-Lung Kuo	MR2713-60	1216
4586	7590 06/22/2004		EXAMINER	
ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE 3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101			EVANS. GEOFFREY S	
ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE TO		TE 101	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1725	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Amultanada	-0			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	4			
Office Action Summary	10/760,421	KUO ET AL.	<i>y</i>			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	Geoffrey S Evans	1725				
Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	un the correspondence addre	9SS			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a roolly within the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this comn ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·					
	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa			erits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			102.			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Aprity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	age			
Attachment(s)						
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-15 	2)			

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Admitted Prior Art in view of Sakanishi et al. in Japan Patent No. 1-222,823 and Nakamura et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,216,513 B1. The Admitted Prior Art as disclosed on page 1 lines 12-22 and figures 8-11 has a machine having an upper surface and a lower surface, a feeding portion disclosed on the upper surface, said feeding portion having a downward surface; a receiving portion disposed on said lower surface; a working zone between said feeding portion and said receiving portion; a wire electrode having two ends and an outer periphery. Sakanishi et al. teaches using forming rollers (elements14) to create a to create a wire (see figure 5) with a substantially rectangular

cross section in order to more accurately machine grooves. Nakamura teaches using rollers spaced by an adjustable working distance (e.g. see last sentence of abstract) to create rectangular wires of varying sizes and using a motor for revolving the forming rolls (e.g. see element 58 in figure 14B). It would have been obvious to adapt the Admitted Prior Art in view of Sakanishi et al. and Nakamura et al. to provide a wire electrode with a cross section having two substantially parallel surfaces, a working width between the two parallel surfaces being smaller than said diameter to more accurately cut grooves and to have an adjustable working distance between the forming rollers so that wire electrodes of varying sizes can be used (wire electrodes smaller in cross section can machine more accurately but are more likely to break during machining).

- 4. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Groos in U.S. Patent No. 4,766,280 uses a wire electrode that is polygonal in shape, and then twisted. Stetler in U.S. Patent No. 6,737,602 B2 using forming rollers in an electric discharge machine.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey S Evans whose telephone number is (571)-272-1174. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30AM to 4:00 PM, alternate Fridays off.

Application/Control Number: 10/760,421

Art Unit: 1725

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571)-272-1171. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)4972-9306.

GSE

Geoffrey S. Evans Primary Examiner

Group 1700